arXiv:1608.08961v1 [physics.flu-dyn] 31 Aug 2016

Observation of Phillips' spectrum in Faraday waves

Gustavo Castillo* and Claudio Falcón
Departamento de Física, Facultad de Ciencias Físicas y Matemáticas, Universidad de Chile, Avenida Blanco Encalada 2008, Santiago, Chile
(Dated: September 1, 2016)

We report the observation of the Phillips' spectrum of gravity surface waves driven by a horizontally moving wave maker interacting with Faraday waves. We measure the temporal fluctuations of the surface wave amplitude at a given location and we show that, for a wide range of forcing parameters, they display a power-law spectrum that greatly differs from the one predicted by the WT theory but coincides with Phillips' spectrum for gravity waves. We compute the probability density function of the local surface height increments, which show that they change strongly across time scales. The structure functions of these increments are shown to display power-laws as a function of the time lag, with exponents that are not linear with the order of the structure function, thus showing that the wave field is intermittent. We argue that the origin of this scale-invariant intermittent spectrum is the Faraday wave pattern breakup due to its advection by the propagating gravity waves, which can be related directly to the Phillips' spectrum phenomenology.

PACS numbers: 47.27.eb, 47.20.-k, 47.35.-i, 05.45.-a,

The nature, generation, properties and evolution of turbulent fields in extended out-of-equilibrium systems is the subject of continuous research due to its implications in transport of conserved quantities across scales in fluid dynamics, condensed matter, plasma and astrophysics. In the case of wave systems, this research has been strongly driven by the development of the tools of Wave Turbulence (WT) [1]. WT deals with the long time out-of-equilibrium statistical properties of dispersive waves in weakly nonlinear interaction, which are solely described by their scale-invariant stationary spectrum of wave amplitudes $S_\eta(f) \propto f^{-\nu}$, where f is the frequency and ν the Kolmogorov-Zakharov exponent. This spectrum has been theoretically predicted, numerically computed and experimentally observed in gravity [2–5] and capillary [6–8] surface waves in fluids, bending waves in elastic plates [9, 10], and nonlinear optics [11, 12]. Applications of WT to a larger number of other fields can be found in [1].

It may seem that WT is a robust and complete theory that can be applied on any weakly dispersive nonlinear wave system, but this is not the case as it is almost never valid over all length scales [13]: there is a breakdown of WT at very large or very low wave numbers. When the breakdown occurs, a new type of spectrum develops, as well as new properties of the turbulent fluctuations [14]. This is the case of the wave amplitude spectrum of surface gravity waves presenting singularities in their slope due to wind forcing, proposed initially by Phillips [15]. In his seminal work, Phillips proposed a power-law spectrum $S_\eta(f) \propto f^{-5}$, arising from advocating local slope singularities by gravity waves, which is different from WT prediction $S_\eta(f) \propto f^{-4}$ for surface gravity waves [2, 6]. Since then, this spectrum has been observed *in-situ* on the sea surface, in very large tanks [15–17] and in laboratory experiments [5, 18]. The idea of Phillips has been generalized to other situations where WT breaks down [19] such as the generation of rough sea foam in the ocean [20] and the d-cone spectra in vibrating elastic plastes [21]. It has also motivated new ideas on the spectra generated by singularities [22] to describe the properties of fluctuating wave fields. In all these studies, there is no information about the robustness of the Phillips spectrum of a fluctuating wave field (for instance, as a function of the forcing parameters) nor on the higher order statistical properties of the fluctuating wave field beyond the predicted Phillips spectrum.



FIG. 1: (color online) Schematic of the experimental setup. (1) Square cell, (2) Vertical shaker, (3) Horizontal shaker, (4) Accelerometer, (5) Wave-maker, (6) Capacitive wire gauge.

In this Letter, we try to answer some of these open questions by means of a simple experiment. Here, we report the experimental observation of the Phillips spectrum of gravity surface waves driven by a horizontally

moving wave maker interacting with a set of standing waves generated by a parametric instability. In this configuration, the local temporal fluctuations of the surface wave amplitude $\eta(t)$ display a power-law spectrum $S_\eta(f) = \langle|\eta_f|^2\rangle$ (*i.e.*, the Fourier transform of the autocorrelation function of $\eta(t)$) over more than half a decade for a wide range of forcing parameters. The observed spectrum differs from the one predicted by the WT theory $S_\eta(f) \propto f^{-4}$, but coincides with the Phillips's spectrum for gravity waves $S_\eta(f) \propto f^{-5}$. This wave field displaying the Phillips spectrum is intermittent, which is shown by computing the probability density function (PDF) of the local vertical height increments and their corresponding structure functions. The PDFs change strongly across time scales, increasing their flatness. The structure functions of these increments display power-laws as a function of the time lag, with exponents that are not linear with the order of the structure function. We argue that the origin of this scale-invariant intermittent spectrum is the Faraday wave pattern breakup due to its advection by the propagating gravity waves, which can be related directly to the Phillips' spectrum phenomenology.

The experimental setup is depicted in Figure 1. A plexiglass square cell (lateral dimensions $L_x = L_y = 10$ cm and height $L_z = 4.5$ cm) is filled with destilled water up to a height $h = 3$ cm. The experimental cell with the working fluid is mounted on an electromagnetic shaker driven sinusoidally by a function generator via a power amplifier. The vertical modulation of the acceleration $a(t) = a\sin(2\pi f_c t)$ is measured by a piezoelectric accelerometer via a charge amplifier. The accelerometer is fixed to the base of the cell, allowing the measurement of the imposed modulation with a resolution of 0.1 m/s^2. For a given excitation frequency f_c, when the acceleration modulation a surpasses a certain threshold a_c, standing waves develop on the fluid surface oscillating at $f_c/2$ through a parametric instability: the so-called Faraday waves [23]. These standing waves interact with a set of propagating waves generated by the horizontal motion of a rectangular plunging acrylic wave maker (6×13 cm^2) set at 1.5 cm inward from one of corners of the cell and driven by another electromechanical shaker via a power amplifier. The wave maker is excited with random noise supplied by a function generator filtered in a frequency range $2-5$ Hz by means of a band-pass filter. The output colored noise has a standard deviation $V_r \in [0.69, 1.30]$ V. The local wave height $\eta(t)$ is measured 5 cm away from the wave maker with a capacitive wire sensor, plunging perpendicular to the fluid surface at rest and adjoined to the experimental cell. The capacitance of the wire gauge, which changes linearly with the fluid level, is measured using a LRC circuit and a DSP Lock-in amplifier [24] (time constant 0.3 ms and a 24 dB/oct roll-off). The linear sensing range of the wire gauge allows measurements from 10 μm up to 30 mm with 80 mV/mm sensitivity. The data of both the fluid level and the vertical acceleration is recorded through a NI acquisition card and then analyzed in Matlab. In the experiments reported in this Letter, the acquisition time is 1 hr, the acquisition frequency is $f_{adq} = 1$ kHz, the excitation frequency is $f_c = 20$ Hz and $a \in [1, 2]$ m/s^2.

In the case where only Faraday waves are excited by vertical vibrations (once the critical acceleration to develop the parametric instability $a_c = 1.08$ m/s^2 is surpassed), $\eta(t)$ displays a discrete set of excited frequencies: the harmonics of the fundamental parametric wave frequency $f_c/2$. At $f_c = 20$ Hz, the typical wavelength of the standing pattern is 1.5 cm. In these experimental runs, the vertical acceleration was set to $a = 1.57$ m/s^2 ($\epsilon = (a - a_c)/a_c = 0.45$). In the case where only random waves are excited by the horizontal motion of the wave maker, no WT spectra (either for gravity or capillary waves) develop due to the low forcing intensity [5]. The typical wavelengths of the random waves in the frequency forcing range are between 6 to 16 cm. The PDF of the wave amplitude in this case is gaussian (not shown here) which shows that nonlinearities in the wave amplitude are low. In the case where random waves are placed in interaction with Faraday waves, a scale invariant spectrum $S_\eta(f) \propto f^{-5}$ develops from f_c to 90 Hz. This type of spectrum is observed for $\epsilon > 0$ (when the parametric instability has already set in the experimental system) and for a large range of V_r (in particular the one reported here for $\epsilon = 0.45$). In Figure 2 we show $S_\eta(f)$ for the three configurations described above. For the last two cases, for frequencies larger than 90 Hz, dissipation over the wire gauge is relevant, which changes the slope of the



FIG. 2: (color online) Main: Log-log plot of the spectra $S_\eta(f)$ for Faraday waves, random waves, and interacting random and Faraday waves as a function of frequency f. The continuous line is a f^{-5} best fit slope. Inset: Compensated spectra $S_\eta(f) \times f^5$ for interacting random and Faraday waves.

spectra.

Two important comments related to the observation of this scale-invariant spectrum must be noticed. First, although such a large value of ϵ may sustain droplet ejection in Faraday waves [25] this is not observed in our experiments (either alone or coupled to randomly excited gravity waves). Thus, no wave breaking is observed. Second, experimental runs with similar values for h, f_c, V_r, a_c were also performed on a larger cylindrical container (30 cm in diameter), displaying the same scale-invariant spectrum. Data from these runs is not presented here because, due to large size and weight of the experimental cell, an off-axis motion appeared once the parametric waves were coupled with the random ones, which lead to a slow change in the acceleration modulation delivered by the shaker and inhomogeneities of the wave pattern.

In the case where random waves are placed in interaction with Faraday waves, the signal presents some "anomalies", which are not displayed in the other two cases. An example of this is shown in Figure 3. It can be seen that these events do not display discontinuities in $\eta(t)$ nor in its derivative, but they do display a strongly erratic behavior. We believe the appearance of these events is responsible for the f^{-5} spectrum, though a thorough analysis is required to conclude this.



FIG. 3: (color online) Top: Temporal trace of the local surface wave amplitude of randomly excited waves over a temporal window of $\Delta t = 5$ s for $V_r = 1.0$ V. Bottom: Temporal trace of the local surface wave amplitude of randomly excited waves in interaction with parametrically excited waves over a temporal window of $\Delta t = 5$ s for $V_r = 1.0$ V and ϵ =0.45. The zoomed region shows one of the "anomalies" in the signal, which we believe yield the f^{-5} spectrum.



FIG. 4: (color online) Normalized structure factors $S_p^{(4)}(\tau)/S_p^{(4)}(0)$ for $p = [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]$. They all show a power-law behavior in the inertial window 5.6 ms$< \tau <$25 ms (besides, the behavior is the same for different values of d). (inset) Exponents $\zeta_p^{(d)}$ as a function of p for $d = 1, 2, 3$ and 4, obtained by fitting power laws $S_p^{(d)}(\tau) \sim \tau^{\zeta_p^{(d)}}$. Continuous lines are best fits following the quadratic relation $\zeta_p^{(d)} = c_1^{(d)} p - \frac{1}{2} c_2^{(d)} p^2$. For $d = 1$ and 2, the quadratic parameter is negligible. Fitting $\zeta_p^{(4)}$ with the above relations yields $c_1^{(4)} = 2.21$ and $c_2^{(4)} = 0.32$.

As WT breaks down and the Phillips spectrum develops, the self-similarity of the wave field should be affected and intermittency may appear. To probe this hypothesis, we calculate the higher-order cumulants of $\eta(t)$. Due to the steepness of the spectrum, to probe intermittency at least third degree increments $\delta_\tau^{(3)}\eta(t) = \eta(t+3\tau) - 3\eta(t+2\tau) + 3\eta(t+\tau) - \eta(t)$ have to be computed to remove the local linear trends in the time lag τ coming from the differentiable part of $\eta(t)$ [26]. Accordingly, in order to study the intermittent properties of the signal $\eta(t)$, we computed the structure functions of degree d and order p, $S_p^{(d)}(\tau) = \langle |\delta_\tau^{(d)}\eta(t)|^p \rangle$. In the case of a power-law spectrum $S_\eta(f) \propto f^{-\nu}$ (such as the one we observed with $\nu = 5$), $S_p^{(d)}(\tau)$ is expected to be scale as $\tau^{\zeta_p^{(d)}}$, and in particular $S_2^{(d)}(\tau) \sim \tau^{\nu-1}$. In Figure 4 we show the behavior of $S_p^{(4)}(\tau) = \langle |\delta_\tau^{(4)}\eta(t)|^p \rangle$. It is observed that the structure factors are indeed power-laws as a function of τ (for any degree d). Thus, we can compute the exponents $\zeta_p^{(d)}$ as a function of p for $d = 1, 2, 3$ and 4 by best fitting a power law in the interval 5.6 ms$< \tau <$25 ms (the inertial window or "equilibrium range" of the observed Phillips spectrum [15]). These exponents are shown in Figure 4. It can be observed that for $d = 1$ and 2, a linear relationship is obtained between the exponent and p, which

shows the differentiable part of the $\eta(t)$. However, when we look at the higher-degree exponents we realize that these exponents are non-linear functions of p, which is a clear signature of the intermittent nature of the wave system. Moreover, these exponents are in good agreement with the theoretical prediction $\zeta_p^{(d)} = c_1^{(d)}p - \frac{1}{2}c_2^{(d)}p^2$ [26]. Additionally, we note that whereas using $d = 1$ or 2 the exponents lead to an underestimated value of $\nu = 5$, the exponents $\zeta_2^{(3)}$=3.58 and $\zeta_2^{(4)} = 3.79$, which show that by increasing d one approaches the observed Phillips spectral exponent. Another feature of the intermittent nature of the acquired signal can be observed by computing the PDFs of the normalized increments $\delta_\tau^{(d)}\eta(t)$ for different values of τ. In our case, since we concluded above that we should use $d = 4$, we computed $\delta_\tau^{(4)}\eta(t)$ for different time lags τ and with them we calculated their PDFs, which are shown in Figure 5. We note that their shapes deform continuously as the time lag τ changes, showing an evolution across scales. Within the inertial window, for small τ the tails of the PDF show a very mild slope which decreases for larger values of $\delta_\tau^{(4)}\eta(t)$, while for larger τ the tails become much steeper. This effect reaffirms the previous results on the intermittent nature of the wave field, which shows larger fluctuations for smaller time lags (*i.e.* small scale intermittency). Thus, the observed wave field displays a scale-invariant power-law spectrum between 20 and 90 Hz and it is intermittent at small scales.



FIG. 5: (color online) Semilog plot of PDFs of the normalized increments $\delta_\tau^{(4)}\eta(t)/\langle|\delta_\tau^{(4)}\eta(t)|^2\rangle^{1/2}$ as a function of $\delta_\tau^{(4)}\eta(t)/\langle|\delta_\tau^{(4)}\eta(t)|^2\rangle^{1/2}$ for time lags time 6.3 ms$< \tau <$25 ms. Curves are displaced by a multiplying factor for better presentation. The arrow shows the direction of increasing τ.

The origin of this intermittent wave field lies in the interaction between the random and parametric waves. The randomly moving piston generates gravity waves which distort the pattern of Faraday waves, changing locally its amplitude and wavelength, and even creating defects. These distortions pass over the wire gauge, oscillating at a much larger frequency than the random wave that act as low frequency carriers. In that sense, it is the same idea developed by Phillips, but without the need of wave breaking nor wave singularities. In fact, no wave breaking nor droplet ejection was observed in the experimental runs. Thus, this "synthetic" Phillips spectrum presents all the ingredients proposed by Phillips while conserving the smoothness of the wave field. It must be noticed that a similar spectrum can be constructed by following the amplitude defects of Faraday waves which are self-generated as a is increased above the threshold of defect turbulence [27]. This suggests a connection between the observed Phillips spectrum and the spectrum of wave amplitudes in the defect-mediated dynamics of pattern forming systems. In our experimental configuration it is observed that the control parameter range for the appearance of a Phillips spectrum is very large and insensitive to the values of f_c, a_c (as long as is large enough to sustain Faraday waves over the random ones) and V_r, which shows the robustness of this type of spectrum.

In conclusion, we have shown that a simple tabletop experiment can display the spectrum driven by singularities described by Phillips for wind-driven ocean waves when a standing wave pattern arising from a parametric instability is coupled with randomly excited gravity waves. The wave field generated by this coupling is intermittent as it can be observed by the nonlinear dependence of the $\zeta_p^{(d)}$ exponents on the order p, and by the change in the shape of the PDF of the normalized increments $\delta_\tau^{(d)}\eta(t)$ when τ changes. Some questions related to the intermittent character of the wave field remain unanswered (such as the possible multifractal structure of the intermittent increments) which we hope can be tackled in the future.

This research was supported by Fondecyt Grant No. 3160032 (G.C).

* Corresponding author: gustavo.castillo.b@me.com

[1] V. E. Zakharov, V. S. L'vov, and G. Falkovich, *Kolmogorov Spectra of Turbulence I: Wave Turbulence* (Springer Series in Nonlinear Dynamics, Springer, 1992); S. Nazarenko, *Wave Turbulence* (Lecture Notes in Physics, Springer, 2011); A. C. Newell and B. Rumpf, Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech. **43** 59-78 (2011).

[2] K. Hasselmann, J. Fluid Mech. **12**, 481 (1962); **15**, 273 (1963).

[3] M. Onorato *et al.*. Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 144501 (2002); A. Pushkarev, D. Resio, and V. Zakharov, Physica (Amsterdam) **184D**, 29 (2003); A. I. Dyachenko, A. O. Korotkevich, and V. E. Zakharov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 134501 (2004)

[4] Y. Toba, J. Oceanogr. Soc. Jpn. **29**, 209 (1973); K. K.

Kahma, J. Phys. Oceanogr. **11**, 1503 (1981).
[5] E. Falcon, C. Laroche, and S. Fauve Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 094503 (2007).
[6] V. E. Zakharov and N. N. Filonenko, J. Appl. Mech. Tech. Phys. **4**, 506515 (1967).
[7] A. N. Pushkarev and V. E. Zakharov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3320 (1996); L. Deike, D. Fuster, M. Berhanu, and E. Falcon Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 234501 (2014).
[8] W. B. Wright, R. Budakian, and S. J. Putterman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 4528 (1996); M. Lommer and M. T. Levinsen, J. Fluoresc. **12**, 45 (2002); E. Henry, P. Alstrøm, and M. T. Levinsen, Europhys. Lett. **52**, 27 (2000); C Falcon, E Falcon, U Bortolozzo, S Fauve, Europhys. Lett **86** (1), 14002 (2009).
[9] G. Düring, C. Josserand, and S.Rica Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 025503 (2006).
[10] N. Mordant Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 234505 (2008); A. Boudaoud, O. Cadot, B.Odille, and C. Touz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 234504 (2008).
[11] S. Dyachenko, A. Newell, A. Pushkarev, and V. Zakharov, Physica D **57**, 96 (1992), C. Connaughton *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** 236901 (2005).
[12] U. Bortolozzo, J. Laurie, S. Nazarenko, and S. Residori, J. Opt. Soc. Am B **26** (12) 22802284 (2009).
[13] L. Biven, S.V. Nazarenko, and A.C. Newell, Physics Letters A **280** 2832 (2001).
[14] G. Dring, A. Picozzi, and S. Rica, Physica D **238**, 15241549 (2009).
[15] O. M. Phillips, J. Fluid Mech. **4**, pp. 426-434 (1958).
[16] H. Mitsuyasu, and T. Honda, J. Oceanogr. Soc. Jpn. **30**,185-198 (1974).
[17] L. Romero, W. K. Melville, and J. M. Kleiss, J. Phys. Oceanogr. **42**, 14211444 (2012)
[18] S. Nazarenko, S. Lukaschuk, S. McLelland, and P. Denissenko, J. Fluid Mech. **642**, 395420 (2010).
[19] A. C. Newell, V. E. Zakharov, Phys. Lett. A **372**, 42304233 (2008).
[20] A. C. Newell, V. E. Zakharov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1149 (1992)
[21] B.Miquel, A. Alexakis, C. Josserand, and N: Mordant, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 054302 (2013), S. Chibaro and C. Josserand, Phys. Rev. E **94**, 011101(R).
[22] E. A. Kuznetsov, JETP Lett. **80**, (2), 8389 (2004).
[23] M. Faraday, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. London **121**, 299 (1831).
[24] L. Gordillo *et al*, Eur. Phys. J. D **62**, 3949 (2011).
[25] C. L. Goodridge, H. G. E. Hentschel, and D. P. Lathrop, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 3062 (1999).
[26] E. Falcon, S. G. Roux, and B. Audit, Europhys. Lett **90**, 50007 (2010).
[27] C. Falcón and S. Fauve, Int. J. Bifurcat. Chaos **19**, 3553 (2009).